

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/980,260	11/01/2001	Toshihiro Tomita	791 169	1318
75	590 09/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Stephen P Burr			JOHNSON, CHRISTINA ANN	
Burr & Brown PO Box 7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Syracuse, NY	13261-7068		1725	
			DATE MAILED: 09/24/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				01			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/980,260	TOMITA ET AL.				
Office Action Su	mmary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Christina Johnson	1725				
The MAILING DATE of t Period for Reply	his communication app	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	idress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS - Extensions of time may be available und after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing - If the period for reply specified above is - If NO period for reply is specified above, - Failure to reply within the set or extende Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37	COMMUNICATION. Ier the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 date of this communication. Iess than thirty (30) days, a reply, the maximum statutory period w d period for reply will, by statute, an three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of vill apply and will expire SIX (6) N cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)				
Status							
1) Responsive to communi	ication(s) filed on <u>01 N</u> e	ovember 2001.					
2a) This action is FINAL .	<i>'</i> —	action is non-final.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance wi	th the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 (D.D. 11, 4 53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25-48</u> is/are pe	nding in the application	٦.					
4a) Of the above claim(s	i) <u>29-48</u> is/are withdraw	n from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are al	lowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25-28</u> is/are rej							
7) Claim(s) is/are of							
8) Claim(s) are subj	ect to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers			·				
9) The specification is object	cted to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on _	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request	that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing shee	et(s) including the correct	ion is required if the draw	ing(s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is	s objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attacl	hed Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<u> </u>	None of: f the priority documents	s have been received.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
3.⊠ Copies of the cert	ified copies of the prior	ity documents have be	en received in this National	Stage			
application from the	he International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed	Office action for a list	of the certified copies r	not received.				
Attachment(s)	22)	A\	ou Cummory (DTO, 440)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-89) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft 		Paper I	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s)			of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		6) 🔲 Other:	··				

Application/Control Number: 09/980,260 Page 2

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 25-28, in the reply filed on July 8, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a complete search would include the claims of all groups and points to MPEP 803. This is not found persuasive because applicant is referring to US restriction practice while the requirement made was lack of unity under PCT rule 13.1. US rules are not applicable.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 29-48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on July 8, 2004.

Specification

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1725

5. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sul et al.

Sul et al. (US 5,772,980) discloses the preparation of a zeolite from a synthesis mixture using TPAOH/Si = 0.032 mole (column 4, Example 1). The crystalline zeolite after synthesis is considered to meet the crystallized zeolite and the zeolite during synthesis is considered to meet a zeolite under crystallization.

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Sul et al.

6. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller et al.

Mueller et al. (US 5,413,975) discloses the preparation of a zeolite using a tetralklylammonium ion/silica ratio in the range of 0.042:1-0.2:1 (column 4, lines 10-15). Suitable ions include tetrapropylammonium (column 4, lines 4-10). The crystalline zeolite after synthesis is considered to meet the crystallized zeolite and the zeolite during synthesis is considered to meet a zeolite under crystallization.

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Mueller et al.

7. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lai.

Lai (US 5,824,617) discloses the preparation of a zeolite using a tetraammonium bromide to silica ratio of 0.02-1 (column 8, lines 5-20). The crystalline zeolite after

Art Unit: 1725

synthesis is considered to meet the crystallized zeolite and the zeolite during synthesis is considered to meet a zeolite under crystallization.

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Lai.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/23378 in view of Lai.

WO 00/23378 discloses a zeolite membrane composition comprising a zeolite membrane coated on a substrate of zeolite having the same or similar composition (page 3). It is taught that the zeolite is formed from a synthesis solution of silica sol and a template of tetrapropylammonium hydroxide or bromide (page 4). The template from the zeolite substrate and zeolite layer are removed in one step (pages 3-4). Suitable zeolites include MFI (page 4).

The difference between the reference and the claims is that the reference does not disclose the TPA/silica ratio.

Lai (US 5,824,617) discloses the preparation of a zeolite membrane of MFI structure using a TPA/silica ratio in the range 0.02-1 (column 8, lines 5-20).

Art Unit: 1725

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the composition of the WO reference to include the use of the ratio taught by Lai. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so in light of the teaching by Lai that such a ratio is suitable to produce the zeolite composition desired by the WO reference. Because both references are concerned with the synthesis of MFI zeolites from silica and TPA, one would have a reasonable expectation of success from the combination.

10. Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. in view of Lai.

Lai et al. (US 6,037,292) discloses a zeolite membrane composition comprising a first zeolite layer in contact with a second zeolite layer (column 2, lines 35-50). It is taught that the zeolite is formed from a synthesis solution of silica and a template of tetrapropylammonium bromide (column 3, lines 55-65). The template from the two zeolite layers are removed in one step (column 4, lines 1-15). Suitable zeolites include MFI (column 3, lines 55-60).

The difference between the reference and the claims is that the reference does not disclose the TPA/silica ratio.

Lai (US 5,824,617) discloses the preparation of a zeolite membrane of MFI structure using a TPA/silica ratio in the range 0.02-1 (column 8, lines 5-20).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the composition of the Lai et al. reference to include the use of the ratio taught by Lai. One of ordinary skill would have been

Art Unit: 1725

motivated to do so in light of the teaching by Lai that such a ratio is suitable to produce the zeolite composition desired by Lai et al. Because both references are concerned with the synthesis of MFI zeolites from silica and TPA, one would have a reasonable expectation of success from the combination.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,667,265 is the English language equivalent of WO 00/23378.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1176. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5, with Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1725

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christina Johnson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1725

9/21/04

CAJ September 23, 2004